Ī	K1m1secc	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
2	X	
3	U.S. SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,	
4	Plaintiff,	
5	V •	19 Civ. 5244 (AKH)
6	KIK INTERACTIVE INC.,	
7	Defendant.	Conference
8	x	
9	A	New York, N.Y. January 22, 2020 2:42 p.m.
		2:42 β.π.
11	Before:	
12	HON. ALVIN K. HELLERSTEIN,	
13		District Judge
14	APPEARANCES	
15	U.S. SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION DIVISION OF ENFORCEMENT	
16 17	For Plaintiff BY: STEPHAN J. SCHLEGELMILCH, Ass DAVID S. MENDEL, Asst. Chief	<del>_</del>
18	LAURA D'ALLAIRD, Counsel	S .
19	COOLEY LLP Attorneys for Defendant	
20	BY: PATRICK GIBBS, ESQ. LUKE T. CADIGAN, ESQ.	
	JULIANNE LANDSVIK, ESQ.	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	THE COURT: Securities and Exchange Commission is	
2	represented here by Stephan Schlegelmilch.	
3	MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: That's correct, your Honor.	
4	THE COURT: Good afternoon.	
5	David Mendel?	
6	MR. MENDEL: Yes, your Honor.	
7	THE COURT: Good afternoon.	
8	MR. MENDEL: Good afternoon.	
9	THE COURT: And Laura D'Allaird.	
10	MS. D'ALLAIRD: Yes, your Honor.	
11	THE COURT: Good afternoon.	
12	MS. D'ALLAIRD: Good afternoon.	
13	THE COURT: And KIK Interactive is represented by	
14	Patrick Gibbs.	
15	MR. GIBBS: Yes, your Honor.	
16	THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Gibbs.	
17	And Mr. Cadigan.	
18	MR. CADIGAN: Yes, your Honor.	
19	THE COURT: Good afternoon.	
20	I called you in because with all the pages of fighting	
21	that you described in your joint letter of January 14, I really	
22	didn't understand the discovery dispute. We're supposed to end	
23	discovery this week, right, Mr. Schlegelmilch?	
24	MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: I believe, your Honor, it's the	
25	28th, so a week from yesterday.	

1 THE COURT: Okay. A 30(b)(6) deposition will not let you finish by the 28th. 2 3 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: That's correct, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: So why should I allow it? 5 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Well, your Honor, we have been 6 seeking this deposition since -- it was first noticed for 7 November, the week of Thanksqiving, and we've been in disagreement about it sort of ever since, trying to --8 9 THE COURT: So that's what my job is, isn't it, to 10 resolve disputes? 11 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Yes, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: If you don't bring the dispute to me, I 13 can't resolve it, can I? 14 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Well, then we would ask for relief 15 from your scheduling order so we can complete the deposition. 16 THE COURT: You're not getting it. The purpose of discovery is to prepare for trial. You've had enough time. 17 18 fact, I think it was you who set the schedule. 19 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: We did jointly, your Honor, with 20 the understanding -- and that letter, which we submitted to 21 your Honor last week, cites this outstanding discovery issue 22 that we would bring before you. 23 THE COURT: How many depositions have you taken so 24 far, roughly? 25 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Roughly? I think five. No. You

K1m1secc mean collectively, your Honor? 1 2 THE COURT: You. 3 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Five. Around five. Five or six. 4 Mr. Mendel probably could --5 THE COURT: Why is that not sufficient to make your 6 case? 7 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Your Honor, the case law that we put in front of the Court makes clear that Rule 30(b)(6) 8 9 depositions are a unique animal. 10 THE COURT: I know what 30(b)(6) depositions are. 11 point is, why didn't you make your case out of the five 12 depositions you took? Or schedule a 30(b)(6) earlier? Or 13 start with a 30(b)(6)? You're using, as Mr. Gibbs points out, 14 30(b)(6) as like a request for admission. 15 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Well, your Honor, I mean, as you well know, the rules permit the parties to use a 30(b)(6) 16 17 deposition --18 THE COURT: It's with my discretion. And exercising 19 my discretion, I think you've taken long enough. If there's 20 anything in particular, you might dissuade me, but generally, 21 which is what you're doing, you don't dissuade me. 22 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: I'm not quite sure how to respond

MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: I'm not quite sure how to respond to that, your Honor. We would just submit that we tried to bring this matter before your Honor as expeditiously as possible, while at the same time trying to resolve it without

23

24

25

court intervention, and this was when we were able to bring it before your Honor, and I apologize for the delay. That was not our intent. I think our hope was that we could --

THE COURT: You're not answering my question. What specifically do you need?

MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Specifically, KIK has made a number of arguments in its answer, and in places like that, your Honor, that the Commission has been cherry-picking statements of KIK.

THE COURT: So what?

MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Well, it's difficult to refute an argument of cherry-picking if KIK won't confirm the universe of public statements that KIK has made regarding the offerings against which our supposedly cherry-picked statements are to be judged. So a number of the topics in the 30(b)(6) that's in front of your Honor today deal with nailing down exactly what public statements KIK made regarding the offerings, to rebut KIK's contention, in its answer and otherwise, that the Commission simply cherry-picked statements regarding the offerings.

THE COURT: If you cherry-pick, KIK statements are irrelevant. Cherry pick means that you had any number, you had an array of cases from which to choose and you decided to go after KIK for some arbitrary reason.

MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: I think KIK's argument, as I

understand it, regarding cherry-picking has to do with which statements we identified in the complaint, which statements of KIK's we identified in the complaint, that --

THE COURT: Pick any ones you want. The question of this case is whether what they're doing is a security or not, right?

MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Absolutely, your Honor.

THE COURT: And what's cherry-picking got to do with that?

MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Because one of the indicia that your Honor will consider in whether KIK marketed, offered, and sold the security was what they said about the token when they sold it. KIK's contention, as I understand it from their answer --

THE COURT: You know all the statements they made when they sold it.

MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: That's exactly what we don't know, and which KIK has so far not confirmed, and KIK has rebuffed discovery on that. They say we cherry-picked, but we don't know the universe of statements from which we're supposed to draw --

THE COURT: I don't understand how you could be accused of cherry-picking and --

MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: I'm in agreement with that, your Honor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Let's say they made 15 statements, of which two fit into the kinds of statements you're interested in, offering to sell a security. What do you care about the other 13? MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: I don't --THE COURT: Or let's say 15 were made that way and you What's the difference? picked two. MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: I think that's exactly the right way to look at it. What I'm --THE COURT: Then you don't need depositions. MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: We also have, in the depositions of individuals that we have conducted, been confronted with, as you are in any deposition of individuals, lapses in memory. A great example of this is Mr. Livingston's testimony during the investigation. THE COURT: Who is Mr. Livingston? MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Mr. Livingston is KIK's CEO. THE COURT: Okay. What did he not remember? MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: During that deposition we asked -or that testimony we asked Mr. Livingston about his appearance on CNBC on the day that KIK announced the token offering, and Mr. Livingston stated that he could not recall being on CNBC. THE COURT: Presumably you have a transcript of what he said.

MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: We have the transcript and we have

 ${\tt K1m1secc}$ 

a video.

THE COURT: What do you care if he remembers or not? Apparently you can use it as a means of impeaching him if he ever testifies.

MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: That is correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: What else do you need? So far you haven't convinced me.

MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: The other topic which I understand last night KIK offered to provide would be information regarding KIK's present status as an entity, as a business, how much cash they have, what they're up to, what they're doing. As you'll recall from the complaint, KIK still controls 30 percent of the outstanding float of the tokens, 3 trillion coins, and your Honor, if we do prevail, if we prevail and you find this is a security, that it was an unregistered offering, we'll be asking the Court to enter an injunction. One of the showings we'll need to make to your Honor is that there is a risk of a violation in the future, and your Honor, we —

THE COURT: They've been selling up to date, haven't they, or you don't know?

MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: I don't know, your Honor. My understanding is that they still own the 3 trillion tokens, but I would — that's my understanding, and I would like to be able to ask questions about what their plans are for the 3 trillion tokens.

1	THE COURT: Have you asked witnesses that question?	
2	MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: The witnesses that we have asked,	
3	that we have conducted depositions of to date, from the last	
4	time we were in here till present, are not current employees of	
5	KIK, so they don't know.	
6	THE COURT: Why did you not take a deposition of	
7	current employees?	
8	MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Because we were hoping to take a	
9	Rule 30(b)(6) deposition on November 26th	
10	THE COURT: Who would know the answer to that	
11	question?	
12	MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: I expect that Mr. Livingston would	
13	know the answer to that question. I expect that	
14	THE COURT: Well, get Mr. Livingston back.	
15	MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: If he would appear for a	
16	deposition, yes, your Honor.	
17	THE COURT: All right. Anything else you want to ask	
18	Mr. Livingston?	
19	MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Not that I haven't covered, your	
20	Honor.	
21	THE COURT: Well, Mr. Gibbs, could we have	
22	Mr. Livingston come back and testify to the issues that	
23	Mr. Schlegelmilch has outlined?	
24	MR. GIBBS: Well, if so ordered, but I don't think	
25	it's necessary, for a few reasons. First of all, I told	

25

Mr. Schlegelmilch directly, repeatedly, that KIK still owns the 1 3 trillion Kin. They haven't sold any since this whole process 2 3 began. 4 THE COURT: But you're not a witness. You don't want 5 to be a witness, do you? 6 MR. GIBBS: Excuse me? 7 THE COURT: You don't want to be a witness, do you? MR. GIBBS: I don't, but it's a simple fact and we can 8 9 stipulate to it. They don't need to convene a deposition and 10 force me to travel to DC and force my client to travel --11 THE COURT: They don't need to stipulate to your 12 version of the facts. That's not right. 13 But my version of the facts --MR. GIBBS: 14 THE COURT: Who do you not want to travel to 15 Washington, DC? Me and the CEO, neither of whom lives in 16 MR. GIBBS: 17 Washington, DC. THE COURT: Where does he live? 18 19 MR. GIBBS: He lives in Canada, outside of Toronto; I 20 live and work in California. 21 It's a simple question. We can put it under oath. 22 It's a fact. THE COURT: Anybody else who would be able to testify 23 24

who lives more closely to DC?

MR. GIBBS: I'm sure there are other people who could

testify. None of them live near Washington, DC. They would all have to travel for -- if it really is limited to this issue, it's a ten-minute deposition. I can't for the life of me understand why that's worth the cost to all parties when it's a simple fact.

THE COURT: Would you like to have the deposition taken in Buffalo, New York?

MR. GIBBS: I would have to check whether that travel is more convenient. I suspect it is, but I don't know.

THE COURT: Probably not. There are probably lots of planes going from Toronto to Washington DC, more so than Buffalo. Doesn't snow as much in Washington DC.

MR. GIBBS: We'd love to host everybody out in California. The weather is very nice.

THE COURT: Maybe next week. Is there a date next week you can have Mr. Livingston come in?

MR. GIBBS: I don't know what his schedule is.

THE COURT: How about Wednesday?

MR. GIBBS: Your Honor, I don't know.

THE COURT: Well, seems to me he might need to make himself available.

MR. GIBBS: Could we do it telephonically? It's a simple question --

THE COURT: Nothing is so simple. You want to do it telephonically?

MR. GIBBS: That would be vastly preferable for us, but honestly, your Honor, do they hold the 3 trillion Kin?

Yes. Do they have a plan for what to do with it? The answer is, not yet, they don't know what they're going to do with it because we don't know what they can do. Simple question.

I should note, by the way, your Honor, they had noticed Mr. Livingston's deposition; my team and I had already flown, and Mr. Livingston had already flown, to Washington, DC to prep him, and the SEC decided at the last minute to withdraw that notice. They made that decision. They know full well he could have answered these questions.

THE COURT: Mr. Schlegelmilch, can you explain that.

MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Yes, your Honor. That is correct. We had tried to negotiate a stipulation to cancel Mr. Livingston's deposition the week earlier but couldn't make it work. So that's correct. But I will say that we agreed to cancel Mr. Livingston's deposition with the understanding that we had at that time already noticed KIK's 30(b)(6) deposition for November the 26th.

THE COURT: Well, that wasn't right. He was there.

MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Well, I didn't know he was there

already. But --

THE COURT: You didn't know he was in Washington?

MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: I did not, your Honor.

THE COURT: You thought he was still in Toronto when

you canceled?

MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: I did, your Honor. I canceled it so he wouldn't have to travel.

THE COURT: Take the deposition on Wednesday in DC or a proximate date that's reasonably convenient to Mr. Livingston.

MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: I know I'm looking a gift horse in the mouth. May I have one additional request. And that would be that Mr. Livingston be prepared to talk about all of these issues, the issues of the KIK's current condition —

THE COURT: KIK's current condition.

MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you have someone else that would know more than Mr. Livingston, Mr. Gibbs?

MR. GIBBS: Probably, but I don't know what Mr. Schlegelmilch means by "current condition."

THE COURT: He wants to know what your business is right now, what you're doing right now. You have the CEO, you take the CEO. If he doesn't know, you'll come back to me and I'll give you somebody else. Take the CEO, take

Mr. Livingston, on Wednesday or a date proximate to that or some other person who you can convince Mr. Schlegelmilch that would know.

MR. GIBBS: I was just going to ask that, your Honor. We're here to talk about a 30(b)(6) notice. If that's the

case, I think we should be able to designate whoever we want, as long as they can answer the questions, as best we understand them. I still think it's too vague.

THE COURT: Take Mr. Livingston's. He's the CEO. He should know what's going on. If he doesn't know, that's an interesting point.

MR. GIBBS: He'll know --

THE COURT: He doesn't have to study. He doesn't have to prepare. You have to prepare. He doesn't have to prepare.

MR. GIBBS: It's because of Mr. Schlegelmilch that we will make sure we prep him because he wants to be able to come back and say we didn't prep him if there are any questions he didn't answer. That's exactly the exposure he's going to set up for us.

THE COURT: You do what you want with your witness.

If you want to prepare him, prepare him. If you don't want to,

don't prepare him. If he doesn't want to be prepared, he won't

be prepared. He's your client.

MR. GIBBS: He'll be prepared.

THE COURT: A Wednesday deposition, or let Mr. Gibbs give you another date say within ten days of that date.

MR. GIBBS: And just to be clear, your Honor, this is limited to the question of KIK's current conditions and financial conditions and operations, including the two specific questions that Mr. Schlegelmilch has identified here in court.

1 THE COURT: Define what you want. MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: KIK's current -- what is KIK doing 2 3 as a business currently, what is it working on. I understand 4 that there is a new entity that's been formed under Canadian 5 law called Code Inc. What is the relationship between Code 6 Inc. and KIK? What assets does KIK have that could satisfy a 7 disgorgement order or a penalty that we would ask your Honor to impose --8 9 THE COURT: That's supplementary proceedings. That's 10 not this. 11 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: And what would be KIK's -- what 12 is --13 THE COURT: When is the last time you know something 14 about KIK's business? 15 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Probably -- not in an admissible 16 form, but we have some Rule 408 materials from prior to --17 during the investigative period, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: When is that? 19 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: It would be from fall 2018, your 20 Honor. 21 THE COURT: You could ask what KIK's been doing from 22 that time to this time, including any affiliates or subsidiaries or other related companies. 23 24 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Understood, your Honor. 25 MR. GIBBS: May I speak to that, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes. 1 The rationale that Mr. Schlegelmilch gave 2 MR. GIBBS: 3 you for this entire line of questioning was their desire to 4 seek injunctive relief to prevent future violations of the 5 federal securities laws. I don't see what some separate entity 6 and what that entity may or may not be doing has to do with 7 that relief. And also, it's a very good illustration of the --THE COURT: You may be right, or they may be 8 9 sufficiently connected that you're wrong. He can do it. 10 Okay. Finished? 11 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Yes, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Anything more, Mr. Gibbs? 13 No, your Honor. MR. GIBBS: 14 Okay. That's done. What happens after THE COURT: 15 that? 16 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Then --17 THE COURT: Expert report. Why do you need an expert 18 report? MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Your Honor, if you find during 19 20 summary judgment that there is a material question of fact, we 21 would like to present this case to the jury with the help --22 THE COURT: Maybe you should wait for summary judgment 23 first. 24 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: If that's what your Honor would 25 order.

25

1 THE COURT: I want to find out. What do you want from your expert? That's not a question of law. 2 3 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: For example, we have an expert 4 that is an expert in finance technology, in how the blockchain 5 works, to explain how the blockchain works to lay members of 6 the jury, to explain --7 THE COURT: It's an injunction case, isn't it? 8 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: It is, your Honor, but it's also 9 one that I think --10 THE COURT: It's a disgorgement case. 11 Okay. That's legitimate. They'll explain blockchain. 12 But it doesn't tell me or the jury what Section 5 requires. 13 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: That is not my goal at all. 14 THE COURT: Okay. But that's not necessary for 15 summary judgment. That's only necessary if you don't get 16 summary judgment. 17 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: We can do it in whatever order. 18 This is sort of the way we always do it, but we can do it in 19 whatever order you would prefer, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: What would you like, Mr. Gibbs? 21 MR. GIBBS: Your Honor, I think we would be fine with 22 holding off expert discovery and doing summary judgment first, 23 because I agree with your Honor. I don't think any expert 24 testimony is going to affect summary judgment.

And if I may, your Honor, I just want to put a pin in

```
this one further issue on the deposition I forgot to follow up
1
 2
      on with the Court.
                          Okay. Go ahead.
 3
               THE COURT:
 4
               MR. GIBBS:
                          May I?
 5
               THE COURT:
                          Yes.
 6
                          Just so that people can make reasonably
               MR. GIBBS:
 7
      solid travel plans, given what I think should be a relatively
      narrow scope of this deposition, may we set a time limit of
8
9
      something like two or three hours?
10
               THE COURT: No. I don't set time limits, but counsel,
11
      if he's repetitive, will not be acting properly and I'll take
12
      that into consideration.
13
               MR. GIBBS:
                          Well --
14
                          I'm not assigning an arbitrary time limit.
               THE COURT:
                          That's fine, your Honor.
15
               MR. GIBBS:
                          I never do, and I don't believe in it.
16
               THE COURT:
17
               MR. GIBBS: That's fine. I understand.
18
               I have a follow-up question about scope, because now
      I'm a little bit confused about whether we're talking --
19
20
               THE COURT: The scope is to find out what KIK did from
21
      the time that the investigation ended until now.
22
               MR. GIBBS: My question is whether the rules should
23
      be -- we should assume we're operating under Rule 30(b)(6),
24
     meaning this deposition is limited to that scope --
25
               THE COURT: No. I think Mr. Livingston is a witness.
```

Tell us what he knows. If he doesn't know, it will be very surprising to me, since he's the CEO of the company. And if he doesn't know, Mr. Schlegelmilch should come back to me and maybe I'll give him somebody else.

MR. GIBBS: But, your Honor, if he's appearing as a fact witness, now I need to prep him on the entire scope of the case, which is what we were fully prepared to do back in November when the SEC --

THE COURT: I think I've heard enough. You can take the deposition Wednesday. Let's finish with it.

Most of the summary judgment wants me to determine that Section 5 is applicable.

MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And you have all the facts necessary to prove that, don't you?

MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: That's our view, your Honor.

THE COURT: So why go through the bother and expense of experts to tell the jury what a blockchain is when you can tell me in your brief?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$  SCHLEGELMILCH: I completely agree with you regarding the blockchain expert.

Mr. Mendel just reminded me that we have a potential additional expert who has -- one of the issues you're going to have to decide, your Honor, is how KIK offered and sold, having marketed the --

1 THE COURT: It's a question of fact. MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: It is, and we are exploring having 2 3 an expert that is an expert in marketing to talk about an objective view of what KIK said when it offered and sold these 4 5 tokens, and you may find that informative --6 THE COURT: Objective view of what someone said? 7 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: The objective view of what someone said is 8 9 what someone said. 10 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Yes, your Honor. And we --11 THE COURT: The inference to be taken from that 12 belongs to me, or the jury, as the fact finder. 13 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Understood, your Honor. I think 14 it would be akin to a survey, a marketing expert in a trademark 15 infringement case that might testify regarding market confusion. That would be admissible evidence on what an 16 17 objective --THE COURT: Section 5 doesn't turn on market 18 confusion. 19 20 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Correct. 21 THE COURT: Section 5 turns on whether or not a 22 security is involved. 23 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Correct. Absolutely, your Honor. 24 THE COURT: You folks are going to be arguing under 25 SEC and how it views that.

1	MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Yes, your Honor.	
2	THE COURT: You don't need an expert.	
3	All right. Go off the record. Talk to Mr. Gibbs.	
4	Assuming that you're going to finish discovery on January 28,	
5	fact discovery on January 28 or reasonably soon after, come	
6	back and give me the dates that you're going to file, that	
7	Mr. Gibbs is going to oppose.	
8	Are you going to make any motions also, Mr. Gibbs?	
9	MR. GIBBS: Yes, your Honor.	
10	THE COURT: All motions will have to be filed on the	
11	same day.	
12	MR. GIBBS: Yes, your Honor.	
13	THE COURT: If you're going to make a motion, you have	
14	the same filing date as Mr. Schlegelmilch.	
15	MR. GIBBS: Understood, your Honor.	
16	THE COURT: All right. Off the record. Go ahead and	
17	talk.	
18	(Counsel conferring)	
19	THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Schlegelmilch.	
20	MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Your Honor, we would propose	
21	opening briefs be due on March 20, which is a Friday.	
22	THE COURT: Motion has to be filed, with supporting	
23	briefs, by March 20. All motions.	
24	MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Thank you, your Honor.	
25	THE COURT: And opposition?	

```
1
              MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: April 24.
 2
              THE COURT: Reply?
 3
              MR. SCHLEGELMILCH:
                                  Mav 13.
 4
              THE COURT: Too long.
 5
              MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: May 8th.
 6
              THE COURT: May 8th. Okay.
 7
              All motions and supporting papers are to be filed by
     March 20; opposition is by April 24; reply is by May 8th.
8
9
              MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Thank you, your Honor.
10
               THE COURT: That's going to follow your deposition,
11
      which will be a witness deposition of Mr. Livingston.
              MR. GIBBS: Your Honor, I've conferred with
12
13
     Mr. Schlegelmilch during the break. I think the person best
14
      equipped to answer what I think are the questions he wants to
15
      ask is Mr. Tanner Philp, P-H-I-L-P.
16
               THE COURT: Say again louder.
17
              MR. GIBBS: The person I think is best equipped to
18
      answer the questions I think Mr. Schlegelmilch wants to ask is
19
      Tanner Philp. T-A-N-N-E-R --
20
               THE COURT: T-A-N-N-E-R? What's the fist name?
              MR. GIBBS: That's the first name. The last name is
21
22
     Philp, P-H-I-L-P.
23
              THE COURT: P-H-I?
24
              MR. GIBBS: L-P. P-H-I-L-P. Philp. I've conferred
      with Mr. Schlegelmilch --
25
```

1 THE COURT: What's his position? 2 MR. GIBBS: I don't remember his precise title, but 3 Mr. Schlegelmilch has taken testimony from him before. 4 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: What I would say, your Honor, is I 5 don't know Mr. Philp's exact title either, but I do know from 6 the investigation that he has the relevant information. 7 THE COURT: He has to consent, and the company has to consent that he'd be a 30(b)(6) witness. 8 9 MR. GIBBS: That's fine, your Honor. I just need to 10 know whether it's a 30(b)(6) or an individual. 11 THE COURT: I think for Mr. Tanner, you want a 12 30(b)(6) deposition. 13 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Understood, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: So it will be a 30(b)(6) deposition of Mr. Tanner Philp. If there's any objection by the company or 15 Mr. Philp, that should be conveyed to Mr. Schlegelmilch by 16 17 close of business tomorrow: And the subject will be the nature 18 of the business of defendant KIK Interactive Inc., from what 19 date? 20 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Your Honor, I don't have a 21 specific date in 2018. My request would be --22 THE COURT: From 2018 through the current date. 23 MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Thank you, your Honor. 24 Including any business conducted through THE COURT: 25 affiliates or the like. Okay? And that deposition will take

```
K1m1secc
      place Wednesday?
1
2
               MR. GIBBS: Subject to witness availability, your
3
      Honor.
 4
               MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Yes.
5
               THE COURT: Or another date that you choose reasonably
6
      proximate to it.
 7
               MR. SCHLEGELMILCH: Thank you, your Honor.
8
               THE COURT: And I think we're finished. Thank you
9
      very much.
10
               ALL COUNSEL: Thank you, your Honor.
11
                                     000
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```